



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,149	04/25/2000	Steven J. Yohanan	15-4-296.53	9307

7590 02/14/2002

Sterne Kessler Goldstein & Fox PLLC
Suite 600
1100 New York Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20005-3934

EXAMINER

SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/557149

Applicant(s)

Polanaga

Examiner

Sax

Group Art Unit

2178

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Response

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SET TO EXPIRE 3- MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a response be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a response within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/19/01
- ☒ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 3-8 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 3-8 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
 - ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 21734

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Declaration filed 11/19/01 has been entered.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cardinal et al (5799318) in view of Doyle (5838906).
4. Regarding claim 3, see Cardinal et al: the abstract, Figures 4, 5, 6, column 2 lines 37-64, column 3 lines 55-68 (note how an item may be a document or email message), column 5 lines 34-64, column 6 lines 50-68, column 10 lines 34-65 (note especially the launch icon discussions). This describes a graphical interactive system which accesses a desired document or email address. A desktop icon is displayed, and when selected launches a browser and accesses the document from its storage address. Cardinal et al do not go into the details that a web site is accessed (which accordingly means the web address is accessed), but do mention email and also mention linking a user object to a variety of computer resources of information. Furthermore, see Doyle et

Art Unit: 2173

al: the abstract, Figures 6, 7B (note launching the browser, note the hypermedia link in the document), column 5 lines 32-38 (explicitly the World Wide Web is being accessed), column 6 lines 50-68, column 7 lines 1-7 (again, the launching of the browser, the links), column 9 lines 35-45 (the embedded link) and lines 50-60 (the link accesses over the Internet), column 13 lines 24-31 (the URL address), column 15 lines 62-68 and column 16 lines 1-9 (graphics) This shows how a web address and therefore site is accessed via a link to an object. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have a website accessed in Cardinal et al, in view of the linking in Doyle et al, because it would provide a convenient computer resource of information to be linked to an object, in a system that links resources of information to objects.

4. Regarding claim 4, the browser in Cardinal et al may be a separate application which is then accessed. Note this in Doyle et al as well that a separate specific browser is loaded up (column 3 lines 1-10).

5. Regarding claim 5, note that Cardinal et al mentions documents being retrieved. The fact that they are retrieved from a network is obvious in view of the Doyle et al ability to access a website, as described above.

6. Regarding claims 6-8, these show the same features as above. In addition, note that Cardinal et al show the email feature as discussed above.

Art Unit: 2173

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. But note that in view of the Declaration, the Gudmundson et al reference has been removed from consideration.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Steve Sax at telephone number (703) 305-9582.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Sax whose telephone number is (703) 305-9582. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238	After Final Communication
(703) 746-7239	Official Communication
(703) 746-7420	For Status Inquiries, draft communication

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


STEVEN SAX
PRIMARY EXAMINER